



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/916,245

07/30/2001

Han-Young Hong

P56422

8634

7590

04/04/2006

Robert E. Bushnell

Suite 300

1522 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20005-1202

EXAMINER

VO, TUNG T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/916,245	Applicant(s) HONG, HAN-YOUNG	
	Examiner Tung Vo	Art Unit 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8,10,12,13 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9,11,14 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1 and 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (US 6,912,351 B1) as set forth in the previous Office Action dated 10/31/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (US 6,912,351 B1) as set forth in the previous Office Action dated 10/31/2005.

Art Unit: 2621

5. Claims 1-8 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsugane et al (US 4,961,211) in view of Cooper et al. (US 5,870,139) as set forth in the previous Office Action dated 10/31/2005.

6. Claims 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsugane et al (US 4,961,211) in view of Cooper et al. (US 5,870,139) in view of the applicant's admitted prior art as set forth in the previous Office Action dated 10/31/2005.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 01/27/2006 fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued that Kim does not anticipate claim 1 because Kim fails to disclose a number of available identifications is twice or more than the number of the cameras; and said identification information comprising a plurality of proper identification bits and a corresponding plurality of auxiliary bits, pages 2-4 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with that applicant. It is submitted that Kim discloses a number of available identifications (CAMERA ID CODE = 0001 bits for each camera so that the number of camera ID code is more then number of cameras of fig. 6) is twice or more than the number of the cameras, said identification information comprising a plurality of proper identification bits (CAMERA ID CODE of fig. 6; Note 0001 bits) and a corresponding plurality of auxiliary bits (CORRESPONDING I-PICTURE DDRESS of fig. 6; Note 00000000 bits), characterized in that the proper identification bits identify which camera generated a

corresponding picture signal (I and P pictures of fig. 6). In view of the discussion above, Kim clearly anticipates the claimed features.

The applicant further argued that Kim teach away from using a single video tape in a single video tape recorder, pages 4-6 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that wherein the picture signal storage medium comprises a single video tape in a single video tape recorder (col. 1); wherein the conventional Time Lapse Video Cassette Recorder is considered a single video tape. In view of the discussion above, Kim clearly anticipates the claimed features.

The applicant argued that the identification bits Kim's monitor ID signal IDM consisting of a 2-bit binary code identify which monitor is to display a generated picture signal, they do not identify which camera generated the picture signal, page 8 of the remarks. However, the argument is not persuasive because the examiner did not use Kim to reject the claimed feature.

The further argued that Tsugane does not teach the monitor ID signal is not the same as the camera ID signal IDC, page 7 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with that applicant. It is submitted that the monitor ID signal is the same as the camera ID signal IDC (col. 7, lines 26-29, B1 and B0 of Table 7, col. 7). Therefore, the claimed feature is unpatentable over Tsugane.

The applicant further argued that the rejection is deemed to be in error for failing to establish a prima facie basis obviousness, pages 8-11 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with that applicant. It is submitted that Tsugane teaches a closed circuit television (CCTV) system (fig. 1) comprising a number of cameras (5-8 of fig. 1) for generating picture signals; a multiplexer (104 of fig. 1) allotting identification

Art Unit: 2621

information to each of the picture signals received from the cameras (Note the multiplexer (104) multiplexes a DI as a picture signal, the IDM monitor as a plurality of proper identifications are the same as the ID camera IDC, and DV as auxiliary information into a multiplexed signal; see col. 7, lines 1-47); said identification information being represented by a predetermined number of bits (IDM bits (2 bits) and DV bits (J=14 bits) are obviously formed into a predetermined numbers of bits to recognize one of the speakers (11-14 of fig. 1) is speaking); so that a number of available identifications (IDM (2 bits) and the DV (J =14 bits) are combined to have 16 bits more than the number of the cameras (4 cameras, 5-8 of fig. 1); see also col. 5, line 41-col. 6, line 3) is twice or more than the number of the cameras (5-8 of fig. 1), said identification information comprising a plurality of proper identification bits (the camera ID signal IDC and the monitor ID signal IDM coincide with each other and represented by two bits of B0 and B1 in the table; col. 7, lines 1-28), and a corresponding plurality of auxiliary bits (DV (J=14 bits) is voice signal and multiplexed by the multiplexer (104 of fig. 1), characterized in that the proper identification bits identify (IDC (B1B0) identifies the number of cameras, IDC(B1B0) of fig. 1) which camera generated a corresponding picture signal (101 of fig. 1). Tsugane teaches the multiplexed signal that is transmitted to a receiver (220 of fig. 1) for displaying on the selected TV monitor (32-35 of fig. 1) and the corresponding voice to the speaker (31 of fig. 1) and a single digital storage medium (71 of fig. 6; Note a frame memory (71) stores the picture signal DI). Tsugane further teaches a monitor (32-35 of fig. 1) for displaying picture signals reproduced, a selection unit (SW5, manual selection) for enabling a user to select picture signals corresponding to a particular one of said cameras for display on said monitor by inputting the

identification information corresponding to said particular one of said cameras (SW1-SW5 of fig. 2; and 9 of fig. 1).

Cooper suggests a picture signal storage medium comprises a single video tape in a single video tape recorder (600 of fig. 1) for storing the picture signals (multiplexed video and audio signals, fig. 1) and allotted identification information output from the multiplexer (fig. 7; Note a video recorder information area (750 of fig. 7) is reserved for the display of information recorded by the video recorder (600 of fig. 1) such as, a timer, date, counter, etc. The camera indicator symbology (760 of fig. 7), placed on the video picture by the video camera code and symbology encoder (270 of fig. 2), displays the number of the video camera (301-304 of fig. 1), which generated the frame or field being viewed. The status indicator symbology (710a-f of fig. 7), status indicator divider (720 of fig. 7), bar graph (730 of fig. 7), dividers for bar graph (740 of fig. 7), and camera indicator symbology (760 of fig. 7) are displayed on a black border created by the video controller (200 of fig. 2) of the video multiplexing system (100 of fig. 1)); a controller (200 of fig. 2) for storing said picture signals and said identification information in said picture signal storage medium, and stored in said picture signal storage medium and outputting the selected picture signals for display on said monitor and a video recorder is obvious a single video tape in a single video tape recorder (600 of fig. 1).

Tsugane teaches the claimed feature above and suggests modifications that would be used (col. 9, lines 25-30), and Cooper suggests rearrangement and modifications would be applied (col. 9, lines 17-24). Therefore, one skilled in the art would combine the suggested modifications of Tsugane and Cooper to make obvious the claimed invention.

The applicant argued that the rejection of claim 5 is deemed to be in error and should be withdrawn, pages 11-12 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that Tsugane teaches a monitor (32-35 of fig. 1) for displaying picture signals reproduced, a selection unit (SW5, manual selection, of fig. 5) for enabling a user (operator) to select picture signals corresponding to a particular one of said cameras (1-4 of fig. 1) for displaying on said monitor (32 of fig. 1, Note one of the signal from the cameras is selected to be displayed on the monitor) by inputting the identification information corresponding to said particular one of said cameras (SW1-SW5 of fig. 2; and 9 of fig. 1, the switches (SW-1-SW-5 of fig. 2) are selected for the particular camera signal to be displayed. In view of the discussion above, the claimed features are unpatentable over Tsugane.

The applicant further argued that the rejections of claims 7 and 12 are deemed to be in error and should be withdrawn, pages 12 and 13 of the remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that Tsugane teaches wherein the logical values of said auxiliary bits (DV (J= 14 bits) are opposite to the logical values of said proper identification bits (IDM = 2 bits), since the disclosure of Tsugane teaches the auxiliary bits and proper identification bits so they are would obviously arranged in opposite or identical of each other, therefore one skilled in the art would arrange the auxiliary bits are opposite to the proper ID bits and the auxiliary bits is constructed identically to the proper ID bits. In view of the discussion above, the claimed features are unpatentable over Tsugane.

The applicant traverses the rejection of claims 10 and 15, pages 13 and 14. The examiner strongly disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that the combination of Tsugane and Cooper teaches the auxiliary bits is 14 includes the three said auxiliary bits, and the applicant's admitted prior art (fig. 3) shows the number of cameras is eight and the identification information comprises three said proper identification bits. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the applicant's admitted prior art (fig. 3) into the combined CCTV of Tsugane and Cooper for the same purpose of recording the multiple images from the cameras onto a single recording with an identifying code that indicates the camera so that the user to easily recognize which cameras are active. In view of the discussion above, the claimed features are unpatentable over the combination of Tsugane, Cooper, and the admitted prior art.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 9, 11, 14, and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2621


the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tung Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7340. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on 571-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Tung Vo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2621